

REMARKS

Claims 1-11, 13-18, and 20, all the claims pending in the application, remain rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2003/0009537 to Wang et al (hereinafter “Wang”).

In the Amendment filed January 14, 2009 (“previous Amendment”), Applicants submitted that, under the Examiner’s current interpretation, Wang does not teach the transmitting of a neutral user interface selected by the user from the alleged integrated user interface (top level page 220). In particular, the Examiner interprets Wang’s general disclosure of collecting all of the ICONs corresponding to the devices to be included in the top-level GUI 220 as the claimed transmitting of a neutral user interface selected by the user from the integrated user interface. However, Wang discloses that a selection of an ICON occurs after the ICONs are collected to form top level page 220 is formed (paragraph 106). Accordingly, Wang’s collection of ICONs for forming GUI 220 cannot correspond to the claimed transmitting of a neutral user interface selected by the user from the integrated user interface.

In response, the Examiner clarifies the interpretation of Wang. In particular, the Examiner asserts that:

“Wang clearly teaches wherein the remote access device sends a request to the interface device via the second network for accessing the first network; and the interface device sends the user interface description to the remote access device via the second network (See paragraph [0014]). Furthermore, Wang teaches wherein the request is routed by the gateway 700 to the outside network 702 (specified by network communication). The UIDGA 408 uses the preprogrammed external portal IP address to generate the TLNUID 250 for the top-level GUI 220 including e.g. an icon graphic representation 710B for the external services, then the GUI 200 is presented to the user. When a user accesses the external link/network by clicking on an icon 710B in the GUI 220 representing a device/service in the outside network 702, the request is sent out of home network 300 to the external network 702 through gateway 700. The Browser 410 is used

to display the top level GUI 220, just the same as the case where no external links are used. (See paragraph [0209]).” Applicants submit that the Examiner misunderstands Wang. In particular, paragraph 14 of Wang is directed to controlling devices on a first network using remote access from a second network. A further description of this embodiment of Wang is discussed from paragraphs 271 on. In this embodiment, the request of paragraph 14 to which the Examiner alludes corresponds to a request for a device page 202 to control the device (See paragraph 277).

In contrast, the request discussed in paragraph 209 of Wang refers to a request to access an external network 702 (i.e., the Internet) to retrieve graphics and icons from an external IP address (e.g., a manufacturers website) to enhance the visual effect of the top-level GUI 220. This request is entirely unrelated to the request of paragraph 14 for a device page 202 to control a selected device residing on the home network.

Accordingly, Applicants submit that the Examiner’s rebuttal shows clear error in logic. Nonetheless, in order to expedite prosecution, Applicants amend independent claim 1 to recite that said user selects said neutral user interface corresponding to a device which the user desires to control among the devices residing on the home network, wherein the gateway converts the transmitted neutral user interface into a device specific user interface which is suitable for the specific client of the user, and wherein the user controls operation of the device using the device specific user interface.

Clearly, the retrieval of icon 710B in GUI 220 does not correspond to a selected neutral user interface corresponding to a device which the user desires to control. Indeed, the icon 710B is a graphic which is selected by the user, and is not used to control a device. The section of Wang which the Examiner largely bases the rejection on (paragraphs 193-231) is directed to the formation of the top-level GUI 220, and any discussion, within this section, of URL addresses

and the like are directed to the retrieval of visually enhancing graphics and icons for the top-level GUI 220. This section makes no mention of device interfaces which are selected from GUI 220 to provide control of a device.

Accordingly, Applicants submit that the Examiner is precluded from adopting the current interpretation of Wang. At best, Wang discloses that a user may select a device among devices displayed in a top-level GUI 220, and a device page 202 corresponding to the device is fetched (See at least paragraph 106).

However, as noted in the previous Amendment, Wang does not explicitly disclose that the device page 202 of the particular device selected by the user is customized to a device displaying the page. Instead, the only portion of Wang which discloses such customization (paragraph 287) merely discloses that the home network directories, such as top level GUI 220, are accommodated based on the capabilities of the device displaying the directory.

The Examiner asserts that this section reads on the individual interfaces of devices. In particular, the Examiner highlights the disclosure in paragraph 287 that “Different remote access devices 1052 may have different versions of home network directory page 1054, and customized remote home network interfaces. For example, a hand-held device 1052 with low resolution may use a text only version, while a high-end PC may have a complex graphics interface.”

However, this assertion that the device page 202 corresponds to a customized remote home network interface is unsupported by the reference. Further, Wang hints that these customized remote home network interfaces correspond to the high level pages including multiple devices on a home network, rather than individual device interfaces such as device page 202. In particular, paragraph 287 discloses that customized home network directories in clued home network top level GUI 1054 and other Home Network Directory Pages. Throughout the

disclosure, and particularly at paragraphs 275 and 277, Wang discloses that such directory pages correspond to the high level pages including multiple devices on a home network such as GUI 1054 and GUI 220.

Thus, Applicants submit that Wang does not teach that the alleged transmitted neutral user interface (fetched device page 202) is necessarily converted into a device specific user interface which is suitable for the specific client of the user, as recited by claim 1.

Because Wang does not teach all of the features of claim 1 in complete detail, Applicants submit that the claim is not anticipated by Wang. Applicants also submit that claims 2-5 are patentable at least by virtue of their dependency on claim 1.

Each of independent claims 6, 7, 10, 14, and 17 recite features similar to those discussed above in conjunction with claim 1. Thus, Applicants submit that these claims are patentable at least for reasons analogous to those discussed above regarding claim 1.

Applicants also submit that claims 8-9, 11, 13, 15-16, 18, and 20 are patentable at least by virtue of their dependency on one of claims 6, 7, 10, 14, and 17.

In view of the above, reconsideration and allowance of this application are now believed to be in order, and such actions are hereby solicited. If any points remain in issue which the Examiner feels may be best resolved through a personal or telephone interview, the Examiner is kindly requested to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

The USPTO is directed and authorized to charge all required fees, except for the Issue Fee and the Publication Fee, to Deposit Account No. 19-4880. Please also credit any overpayments to said Deposit Account.

Respectfully submitted,

/ S. Stuart Lee /

SUGHRUE MION, PLLC
Telephone: (202) 293-7060
Facsimile: (202) 293-7860

WASHINGTON OFFICE

23373

CUSTOMER NUMBER

S. Stuart Lee
Registration No. 61,124

Date: June 24, 2009